

BELL ATLANTIC RESPONSE TO MA DTE KPMG EXCEPTION

Exception #: 14 Addendum #1

Component: **KPMG is unable to replicate certain metrics values reported on the Bell Atlantic-Massachusetts' (BA-MA) Carrier-to-Carrier Reports as a result of change management and calculation issues.**

Domain: POP

Date Uncovered by KPMG: 7/13/00

Date BA Received: 7/13/00

Date BA Responded: 7/20/00; 7/21/00 (1st Revision)

KPMG Summary Statement and **KPMG cannot consistently replicate Pre-Ordering and Provisioning metrics values. Consequently, KPMG cannot verify that BA-MA is accurately reporting metrics values on the Carrier-to-Carrier reports.**

BA Response: As part of the PMR1 Metrics Replication test, KPMG attempted to replicate the values as reported on the December 1999, January 2000 and February 2000 final CLEC Aggregate Carrier-to-Carrier Reports based on the 2/28/00 New York State Carrier-to-Carrier Guidelines. The numerous changes to the Pre-Ordering algorithms and PERL programming code (addressed in Exception #14) have hindered KPMG's replication efforts.

7/21/00 BA Response:

In the early phase of the PO metrics testing, communication between BA and KPMG was not as consistent as in subsequent months. It was a surprise to BA to observe that the December data was not fully replicated. While BA acknowledges that the PO-1 metrics change from month to month, BA feels that sufficient information was provided to KPMG for the replication process.

Because BA is not privy to KPMG's code and methodology used to derive KPMG results, BA is not able to determine in all situation why the replicated results do not match BA's results for December and January.

Changes to the PO-1 metric processes are noted in the Perl and Excel macro codes used by BA to calculate the monthly results. In an effort to improve the replication process, BA created and delivered to KPMG on 6/1 an English algorithm document. This document was reviewed on 7/20 to ensure accuracy and provided to KPMG on 7/21 without changes. In addition, BA provided support as requested by KPMG during the replication process and is available for the March replication.

On the PO-2 metrics, BA disagrees with KPMG's assessment for this family of metrics, and believes that KPMG has their own interpretation of how the metric should be calculated. BA analyzed the high variances in counts for the month of January, and was able to replicate KPMG's counts. KPMG matches BA's counts for PO-2-01 and PO-2-02, which is scheduled minutes

and includes prime and non prime time. For PO-2-03, count is the scheduled minutes prime time only, hence the variance.

In addition, BA documented four sessions with KPMG to respond to various queries on this family of metrics and is available to work with KPMG during the replication of the March numbers.

In the area of provisioning, algorithms provided in the early stage of the testing were not always updated to reflect the current month's business rules. The January implementation of the forest and tree queries, brought consistency to the process which resulted in successful replication for the months of January and February.

For the PO-3 family of metrics, KPMG identified in an earlier observation that BA was not calculating the Contact Center Availability Ordering metrics according to the C2C guidelines. The metric formula should be (# of calls answered w/in 30 seconds divided by # of calls answered + 15% abandoned calls + 10% busy calls) and not (# calls answered w/in 30 seconds divided by # of calls answered).

BA corrected the formula and reissues the C2C reports for the period July 1999 through May 2000 to both KPMG and the DTE.

Because of the great variance between KPMG and BA counts in some of the metrics identified in this addendum, BA is requesting that KPMG either provide their test criteria, or replicate these metrics using another month's data.

At KPMG request, BA provided between 7/20 and 7/21 the pertinent files and algorithms for KPMG to replicate March Provisioning and PreOrdering metrics. All domain subject matter experts will work closely with the KPMG team to ensure that all methodologies are understood.

7/20/00 BA Response:

In the early phase of the PO metrics testing, communication between BA and KPMG was not as consistent as in subsequent months. It was a surprise to BA to observe that the December data was not fully replicated. While BA acknowledges that the PO-1 metrics change from month to month, BA feels that sufficient information was provided to KPMG for the replication process.

Changes to the PO-1 metric processes are noted in the Perl and Excel macro codes used by BA to calculate the monthly results. In an effort to improve the replication process BA began to include copies of these in the regular monthly data distributions to KPMG starting in February 2000. In addition, BA provided support as requested by KPMG during the replication process.

Because BA is not privy to KPMG's code and methodology used to derive KPMG results, BA is not able to determine why the replicated results do not match BA's results for December and January.

On the PO-2 metrics, BA disagrees with KPMG's definition of the metric calculation. The formula in the guideline is (Number of hours scheduled less number of scheduled hours not available)/(Number of hours scheduled)*100. Because there are currently six (6) boxes, BA makes allowance in the calculation to capture all of the boxes results.

In the area of provisioning, algorithms provided in the early stage of the testing were not always updated to reflect the current month's business rules. The introduction of the forest and tree query implemented in January brought consistency to the process, which resulted in successful replication for the months of January and February.

Because of the great variance between KPMG and BA counts in some of the metrics identified in this addendum, BA is requesting that KPMG either provide their test criteria, or replicate these metrics using another month's data.